

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Disclosed Prior Art in view of Taguchi et al. (US 5,745,089) and Takeda et al. (US 4,651,148).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 3, 9, 15, and 17. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are pending for further consideration.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Disclosed Prior Art in view of Taguchi et al. (US 5,745,089) and Takeda et al. (US 4,651,148). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon references that neither teach nor suggest each feature now recited in amended independent claims 1, 3, 9, 15, and 17.

The Office Action admits that "[t]he admitted prior art as modified by Taguchi does not disclose the device comprising during application of a scanning signal to a pre-stage gate line, a subsequent scanning signal is applied to a gate line." Thus, the Office Action relies upon Takeda et al. to remedy the deficiencies of Taguchi et al. As a result, the Office Action alleges that "it would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the device the admitted prior art as modified by Taguchi to apply a subsequent scanning signal to a gate line during application of a scanning signal to a pre-stage gate line as taught by Takeda so as to provide a driving method that effectively minimizes the

voltage decline caused by incomplete charge against the display picture element electrodes through the switching transistors, and effectively prevents possible degradation of the display characteristics (see col. 4, lines 46-55 of Takeda).” Applicants respectfully disagree.

Independent claims 1, 3, 9, 15, and 17, as amended, all recite a method of driving a liquid crystal display including the feature “wherein during the application of a scanning signal to a pre-stage gate line, a subsequent scanning signal is applied to a gate line so that a voltage level of the scanning signal applied to the pre-stage gate line is attenuated by the subsequent scanning signal applied to the gate line.”

In contrast to the Applicant’s claimed invention, Takeda et al. teaches a method of driving a liquid crystal display, wherein each scanning signal applied to each scan line is overlapped with neighboring scanning signals. According to Takeda et al., the data voltage is sufficiently charged during scanning timing, and the time interval for applying the scanning signal is extended from 1 horizontal period to 2 horizontal periods. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Takeda et al. fails to teach or suggest a method of driving a liquid crystal display wherein “a voltage level of the scanning signal applied to the pre-stage gate line is attenuated by the subsequent scanning signal applied to the gate line,” as recited by independent claims 1, 3, 9, 15, and 17, as amended, and hence dependent claims 2, 4-8, 10-14, 16, and 18-20.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 3, 9, 15, and 17 are neither taught nor suggested by Applicant’s Disclosed Prior Art, Taguchi et al., and/or Takeda et al., whether taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-

discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

**CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendments, reconsideration, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS**

By:   
David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: August 13, 2004

**Customer No. 09629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202)739-3000